

4.2. Subject to this amendment the Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 30th Planning Committee Meeting.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. PLANNING APPLICATION 08/90177/REMODA (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Reserved Matters Application for access, appearance, layout and scale of Under Bridge U05 providing a partial discharge of details required by condition OD.O.19 (submission of details for bridges) and discharge of details required by Condition OD.O.59 (foundation details) of Olympic Legacy Facilities Planning Permission Reference 07/90010/OUMODA.

Land within Olympic Park Planning Delivery Zone 6 to the North West of the proposed Velodrome, to the south of the A12 and to the east of the River Lea

- 5.1. James Lough (Arup) and John Carpenter (Allies and Morrison), presented the proposals including illustrative drawings on behalf of the applicant for the new bridge U05 forming part of the main pedestrian access across the loop road underpass from Eton Manor to the North end of the Olympic Park. The bridge was needed to serve construction traffic for the Games from January 2009.
- 5.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The application was for partial discharge of details as Reserved Matters under condition OD.O.19 pursuant to outline planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA. The bridge was to be a permanent structure used by pedestrians during the Games and by pedestrians and cyclists in Legacy to cross the Loop Road just south of the A12 and linking directly to existing bridge E13 over the A12. Bridge U05 had been designed to harmonise with bridge E13 and would have a similar section and detailing. The bridges would also provide access for articulated lorries servicing the EDF headhouse just south of U05.
- 5.3. In order to cater for the pedestrian flows during the Games bridge E13 was to be permanently widened by adding cantilevered footways designed to bear pedestrians only. This would give the appearance of a traditional road with lower central roadway and raised footways. The footways would be separated from the central section of the bridge by high kerbs (standard non-mountable kerb detail) and railings which would prevent vehicles trespassing outside the central surface and also prevent pedestrians tripping off the footway. The existing parapets would be replaced with new solid concrete parapets to shield pedestrians from the noise and views of the A12 below.
- 5.4. Members noted that the design of bridge U05 was largely dependent on the proposals for E13, which had been designed to meet Transport for London's (TfL) requirements for segregation of vehicles on bridges. The resulting treatment of E13 was still subject to discussions with TfL who had to agree the design and to allow access for construction above the A12: bridge E13 was therefore not part of the application.
- 5.5. Members were concerned that although bridge U05 was predominantly for pedestrian use the design, with its segregated lower central surface, would not

Condition

Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawings hereby approved in part (approval not being granted for the concrete kerb sections to the bridge deck, the two metal corner parapets, the metal hand rails to inside of the concrete parapets, the metal balustrade above the kerb to the pedestrian walkway, nor the level and surface treatment of the bridge deck (including the steps shown on the approaches to the pedestrian only walkways) as shown on those drawings), prior to [trigger – date (e.g programmed submission of E13 details) or commencement of above ground development], details of the surface treatment and level of the bridge deck between the 1400mm high concrete parapets shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details to be submitted for approval shall include the design and appearance of the following elements for both Games and Legacy Phases:

- i. Any kerb and/or bollard and/or balustrade or other form of structure or treatment which is necessary to delineate the central section of the bridge suitable for cycling and occasional vehicular maintenance traffic (“the Central Section”) from the pedestrian only walkways on either side of the Central Section;
- ii. The finished surface level and treatment of the whole of the bridge deck (i.e. the whole of the Central Section and the pedestrian only walkways);
- iii. The provision of ramped access (to be Disability Discrimination Act compliant) on at least the northern and southern approaches to the eastern pedestrian only walkway;
- iv. An alternative design for the two metal corner parapets shown on the drawings; and
- v. The hand rails to the inside of the concrete parapets (which shall complement (i) to (iv) above).

The submission of these details shall be accompanied by a study which investigates options for regulating the use of the Central Section by vehicular traffic (including the installation and maintenance of rising bollards across the Central Section of the deck either within the bridge structure or on its immediate approaches). The study shall recommend a preferred option to be pursued and, as appropriate, include the details of the design and external appearance of the preferred option (e.g. rising bollards) for prior approval by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the bridge is of a satisfactory design and appearance and makes suitable inclusive access provision.

Informatives:

New Informative 1:

The details hereby approved comprise the following:

**6. PLANNING APPLICATION 08/90143/REMODA
(AGENDA ITEM 5)**

Submission of second stage reserved matters for the Olympic Stadium (pursuant to condition OD.0.16 of Outline Permission 07/90010/OUMODA) to provide details of the layout, scale, appearance and external materials of the Stadium. The submission also provides an indication of how the Stadium is to be reduced at Legacy Transformation.

Olympic Stadium Site. Land Bounded By The River Lea, City Mills River And The Greenway, Contained Within Planning Delivery Zone 3A Pursuant To Outline Permission Ref: 07/90010/OUMODA.

6.1. Ian Crockford (ODA Project Sponsor), Patrick Grincell (Savills) and Tom Jones (HOK) presented the proposals on behalf of the applicant for the upper parts of the Stadium, the foundations and lower structure having been approved by the Committee in March 2008. The proposals were for a temporary structure which would be dismantled after the Games. Some features of the design including the fabric Wrap, the roof, and sports lighting had been amended since Members last saw them. It was now proposed that the Wrap would consist of vertical panels twisted to permit access, but full details of the treatment and material would be submitted later. The West stand had also been amended but remained a temporary structure which would not be acceptable in its current form as a permanent facility. Illustrative material including models showed the Stadium in the context of the potential treatment of the podium and the service 'pods', which would be the subject of separate later applications. LOCOG, who were working closely with the Stadium team, would be considering the 'pods' as part of the overall approach to overlay.

6.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The application was for approval of the layout, scale, appearance, and external materials of the Stadium as the second stage of Reserved Matters in accordance with the planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA which had granted outline permission for the Stadium and other venues.

6.3. In response to their questions Members noted that:

6.3.1. Cost benefit analysis had shown that it was not financially viable to install double plumbing for water harvesting from the temporary roof during the Games.

6.3.2. Proposed Informative 7 addressed the issue of availability of wheelchair seating in the reduced Legacy stadium. Members also noted that since it was usual to group spectators together when not all the seats were occupied, wheelchair users would not be isolated.

6.3.3. The position of the Olympic flame was not part of the application. The outline permission showed a separate cauldron outside the building but the proposals allowed for some flexibility in locating the flame on the roof (similar to the Beijing stadium) if that was required.

6.4. Members emphasised the need for a coherent approach to the appearance of the Park and the importance of the Stadium setting within that context. They considered that the design of the 'pods', which might later be recycled

The ODA planning committee in their consideration of the application commented that one way these design objectives could be achieved would be through a design competition. Such a design competition should if possible encourage involvement by smaller architectural practices. Should a design competition not be possible for project programme reasons, the ODA and/or LOCOG are encouraged to utilise established design review processes (such as the CABE/DfL Olympic design review panel) and encourage a diversity of design approaches in the resolution of the selection of the final design which is submitted to the ODA LPA for approval pursuant to condition OG.3

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8. The Head of Development Control was aware that there had been complaints about noise from soil-washing by residents of Hackney Wick but no complaints had been made to PDT. It had been raised with Environmental Health Officers at the public protection forum and it was understood that the situation was under discussion with ODA as the Promoter.
9. Members noted that there would be a briefing session on Tuesday 9 September but that there might not be a Committee meeting that evening. In that case the next Committee meeting would be on Tuesday 23 September 2008.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.40 pm

Signed:

Z. Baldry

Chair

Date: 13/1/2009